

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-2 and 4-21 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 2, 8, 11, 15, 18 and 19 being independent. Claim 3 has been cancelled by this amendment and claims 15-21 have been added by this amendment, which do not add any new subject matter.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication on page 4 of the outstanding Office Action that claims 2 and 11 would be allowable. For at least the reasons detailed below, all pending claims should be considered allowable.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112***

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended claims 1-14 in an effort to correct each of the informalities identified by the Examiner and in an effort to place the claims into proper form for U.S. patent

practice. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103***

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Manabe et al. (US 5,633,755) and claims 4-10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manabe et al. in view of Baldwin et al. (US 5,369,433). These rejections are respectfully traversed insofar as they pertain to the presently pending claims.

Independent claims 1 and 8 are directed to an optical source device and include among the combination of elements an optical reflector and optical reflectors, respectively. The optical reflector of claim 1 reflects the deflected light substantially back towards the optical deflector and substantially towards the lamp. The optical reflectors of claim 8 reflect the deflected light substantially back towards their respective optical deflectors and substantially towards a color-separating element. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to teach or suggest at least these above recited features of independent claims 1 and 8.

Manabe et al. is directed to a projection apparatus that is utilized for a projection TV. The projection apparatus of Manabe et al. includes a light 11, a reflector 12, a mirror 13, an

illumination stop 19, a lens 14, and a DMD 15. The light produced by the light 11 is directed towards the mirror 13 and is then guided through the illumination stop 19 and the lens 14 towards the DMD 15. If the DMD is in the "on" position, the light is directed towards the screen 18. If the DMD is in the "off" position, the light "propagates back along the same path as the incident light" and is then "returned via the mirrors 13 and 12 to the light source 11," see col. 4, lines 28-29, and col. 4, lines 62-63, respectively. In other words, the light is reflected from the DMD 15 to the mirror 13.

Thus, the device of Manabe et al. fails to teach or suggest, as stated above, an optical reflector for reflecting the deflected light from the optical deflector along an axis of the second direction substantially back towards the optical deflector and substantially towards the lamp, as recited in claim 1, or substantially towards a color separating element, as recited in claim 8.

Accordingly, in view of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

Claims 2 and 11, which the Examiner indicated to be allowable as stated above, should be considered allowed because Applicants have amended the claims into independent form.

Dependent claims 4-7 and 9-14 should be considered allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim.

New claims 15-21 should be considered allowable at least because the cited art fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements including: an optical reflector for reflecting the deflected light from the optical deflector along an axis of said second direction substantially back towards the optical deflector and substantially towards the lamp, as recited in claims 15 and 19; and the step of directing a shaped light beam to a projection screen and a reflector assembly by an optical deflector having a plurality of independently adjustable mirror elements, the light beam being directed to the projection screen during a first position of the mirror elements and the light beam being directed to the reflector assembly during a second position of the mirror elements, as recited in claim 18.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, this application appears to be in condition for allowance and the Examiner is, therefore, requested to reexamine the application and pass the claims to issue.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully

Application No. 10/082,086

requested to contact Martin Geissler (Reg. 51,011) at telephone number (703) 205-8000, which is located in the Washington, DC area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Michael K. Mutter, Reg.#29,680

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

MKM/MFG:tm  
0925-0192P

Attachment